

JAN 16 2007

Appl. No. 10/729,003
Amdt. dated 01/16/2007
Response to Office Action of 11/17/2006

Attorney Docket No.: N1085-00139
[TSMC2002-1238]

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-14 were previously pending in the subject application and each of claims 1, 3-7 and 9-14 has been rejected in the subject Office action.

Applicants respectfully request re-examination, reconsideration and allowance of each of pending claims 1, 3-7 and 9-14.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102 – Arnold Reference

On page 2 of the Office action, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12-14 (including independent claims 1 and 7) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Arnold, et al. (US 2004/0177271), hereinafter "Arnold". Applicants respectfully submit that these claim rejections are overcome for reasons set forth below.

Claims 1 and 7 represent the independent claims. To summarize, each of independent claims 1 and 7 recites the following aspects using slightly different language:

* A plurality of computers, each of the computers maintaining a similar database.

* Applying a first request to a first computer of the plurality of computers.

* If the first request matches data filtering criteria, it is expunged and prevented from propagating throughout the other computers of the plurality of computers.

Briefly and in summary, the claimed invention, in particular claims 1 and 7, is distinguished from the Arnold reference because the claimed invention provides a plurality of computers with similar databases thereon and applies a request to a *first computer of the plurality of computers*. Data filtering criteria is applied to the first request which has been applied to the first computer and if the first request matches data filtering criteria, the first request is *expunged* and prevented from propagating throughout other computers of the plurality of computers, as it would otherwise be

Appl. No. 10/729,003
Amdt. dated 01/16/2007
Response to Office Action of 11/17/2006

Attorney Docket No.: N1085-00139
[TSMC2002-1238]

allowed to do. "Applying" is used in the conventional sense in claims 1 and 7 – see Figure 3 in which Large Data Purge 210 is "applied" to Transaction Log 112 and Capture Program 114 of computer system 110 having similar databases as computer systems 130, 150. In other words, the request resides within and is sent to one of a plurality of similar computers and the data filtering criteria determines whether or not the request is allowed to propagate through other of the plurality of (similar database) computers.

In contrast, Arnold is directed to *unsent data requests* and Arnold does not provide a plurality of computers with similar databases through which a request may propagate. Paragraph [0004] of Arnold indicates "The present invention is directed to a method and system for identifying content in an unsent electronic message An electronic screening tool is applied to the unsent electronic message prior to transmission of the unsent electronic message from a server . . ." The message is not allowed to be applied to a first computer of the plurality of computers with similar databases in Arnold.

Rather, the system of Arnold that identifies the content in the unsent message is not disclosed as being similar to anything, much less being a computer having a similar database as other computers through which the message may propagate. With respect to paragraph [0150], Applicants respectfully submit that this paragraph does not disclose *a plurality of independent computers . . . , each of said computers maintaining a similar database thereon*. Paragraph [0150] merely provides APIs 1100, 1200, 1300 "to give any of the subsystems access to the System 1000 data." This falls far short of providing a plurality of independent computers, each maintaining a similar database and through each of which a request may propagate. While paragraph [0150] also provides "This design pattern allows the location of databases on one or more physical computers while other components of the System 1000 reside on different computers," this does not disclose or suggest that independent computers having similar databases are in communication with System 1000 and that a request which propagates through

Appl. No. 10/729,003
Amdt. dated 01/16/2007
Response to Office Action of 11/17/2006

Attorney Docket No.: N1085-00139
[TSMC2002-1238]

one of the computers would also propagate through others if not filtered. Neither the message analyzer module of FIG. 6, the risk assessment distributor and risk assessment integrator modules of FIG. 7, nor the knowledge base subsystem of FIG. 11 is disclosed as being one of a plurality of computers with similar databases.

5 Claims 1 and 7 recite the feature that, if the first request matches the data filtering criteria, the first request is expunged. Since the first data request was applied to one of the computers, it is logically expunged from that computer. In Arnold, the first request never reaches the first of a plurality of computers with similar databases as Arnold expunges the unsent electronic message from the server not one of the plurality
10 of computers to which it was already applied.

Independent claims 1 and 7 are therefore distinguished from Arnold and the rejection of claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Arnold, should be withdrawn. Each of the other claims rejected under this section depend from one of the aforementioned independent claims and are similarly distinguished.
15 Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), should be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 4 of the Office action, claims 5 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold. Applicants respectfully submit that these
20 claim rejections are overcome for reasons set forth below.

The Office action contends, on page 4, that, since Arnold does not restrict the time period, it would have been obvious to program any time period. This assertion does not make up for the above-stated deficiencies of Arnold which distinguish Arnold from the claimed invention and therefore independent claims 1 and 7 are distinguished
25 from Arnold in view of the Office action comments. Dependent claims 5 and 11 are similarly distinguished by way of their respective dependencies from claims 1 and 7,

Appl. No. 10/729,003
Amdt. dated 01/16/2007
Response to Office Action of 11/17/2006

Attorney Docket No.: N1085-00139
[TSMC2002-1238]

and therefore the rejection of claims 5 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), should be withdrawn.

JAN 16 2007

Appl. No. 10/729,003
Amdt. dated 01/16/2007
Response to Office Action of 11/17/2006

Attorney Docket No.: N1085-00139
[TSMC2002-1238]

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, each of pending claims 1, 3-7 and 9-14 is in allowable form and the application in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully and expeditiously requested.

5 The Assistant Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary to give effect to this filing and to credit any excess payment that may be associated with this communication, to Deposit Account 04-1679

Respectfully submitted,

10

Dated: January 16, 2007


Mark J. Marcelli (Reg. No. 36,593)
Attorney for Applicants

15

20 DUANE MORRIS LLP
101 West Broadway, Suite 900
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 744-2200
Facsimile: (619) 744-2201